

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending and have been rejected. Applicants have amended claim 9 and added new claims 21-25. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance.

### Interview Summary

The undersigned attorney wishes to express his thanks to the Examiner for the telephonic interview on July 31, 2008. During the interview, the Declaration (attached hereto) by one of the co-inventors was discussed. Furthermore, the allowability of the pending claims and potential new claims were discussed. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the Declaration showed that heating the slurry of pigment particles, epoxy compound and solvent did produce a different product from the unheated process. The Examiner indicated that she was open to reconsider the allowability of the pending claims and any new claims directed toward heating temperatures for reacting the pigment particles and epoxy compound. However, no definitive agreement was reached during the interview.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mullin* (U.S. Patent 3,326,827). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Attached hereto is a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132, submitted by Ping-Lin Guo, a co-inventor of the invention claimed in this application. As the Examiner acknowledged, the test results disclosed in the declaration show that heating (i.e., raising to a temperature above the ambient, as one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand) the slurry of pigment particles, epoxy compound and solvent results in a different product than an unheated process.

Applicants respectfully reiterate their arguments for allowability of claims 1-20 in their response to the previous Office action and incorporate those arguments herein by reference. In response to those arguments, the Examiner contends that *Mullin*'s disclosure of drying the mixture to volatilize the solvent reads on "an elevated temperature". Applicants respectfully disagree because mere disclosure of drying does not imply drying by heating. For example, drying organic solvents by vacuum is a common technique. Furthermore, there is no evidence

that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that drying by heating would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved product. *See*, MPEP 2143(D)(3).

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mullin*.

#### New Claims

New claims 21-25 have been added. As each of the new claims ultimately depends on a respective one of the claims 1-20, for at least the same reasons stated above, claims 21-25 are allowable.

#### Summary


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Date: September 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tong Wu  
Reg. No. 43,361  
TW/cjc